

California Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board
Open Meeting Minutes
June 18, 2015, Board Meeting

The California Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board (Board) convened its meeting in open session at the call of Marybel Batjer, Secretary, California Government Operations Agency, at 400 R Street, Sacramento, California, on Thursday, June 18, 2015, at 10:10 a.m. Also present was Board member Richard Chivaro, Deputy State Controller and Chief Counsel, acting for and in the absence of Betty T. Yee, Controller, and Board member Michael Ramos, San Bernardino County District Attorney.

Executive Officer Julie Nauman and Chief Counsel Wayne Strumpfer were in attendance. Tisha Heard, Board Liaison, recorded the meeting.

The Board meeting commenced with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Item 1. Approval of Minutes of the May 21, 2015, Board Meeting

Chairperson Batjer and Member Chivaro approved the minutes of the May 21, 2015, Board Meeting. Member Ramos abstained from the vote.

Item 2. Public Comment

Public comment was provided by Christine Ward, Executive Director, Crime Victims Assistance Network and iCAN. Ms. Ward thanked the Board for the work being done to make CalVCP more victim friendly. Because of those efforts, more victims are receiving assistance from CalVCP.

Ms. Ward commented that although the CalVCP application has been translated into many languages, correspondence from CalVCP is solely in English. She commented that her clients bring letters received from CalVCP to her office for translation into their spoken language by her staff. Ms. Ward stated that she was informed that the matter was being addressed.

Executive Officer Nauman reported that Mindy Fox, CalVCP Deputy Executive Officer, would give a comprehensive presentation on the work completed as a result of grants CalVCP received from the Office for Victims of Crime that would address the issue identified by Ms. Ward.

Item 3. Executive Officer Statement

Office for Victims of Crime Grants – Implementation Update

Executive Officer Nauman reported that Mindy Fox's presentation would highlight the great work underway at CalVCP. Ms. Nauman stated that she was proud to report that CalVCP is thinking strategically about how it can improve and better meet the needs of victims.

VCGCB's Strategic Planning Process

Executive Officer Nauman reported that CalVCP was engaged in its Strategic Planning process. Several meetings were scheduled and staff had an opportunity to meet with CalVCP consultants to share their thoughts as a part of the process. A Mission Statement will be drafted and CalVCP is finalizing its Values Statement. It is anticipated that the Strategic Plan will be completed in the fall. Ms. Nauman reported that she would share the finished product with the Board.

Item 4. Contract Report

Solicitation

Independent Verification and Validation

Vendor - Unknown

Purchase Order Number – Pending

Amount: \$350,000

Term: 8/1/15 – 10/31/16

Based on consultation with CalTech, CalVCP is seeking a vendor to provide Independent Verification & Validation (IV&V) services to support the CaRES Modification Project. IV&V is a system engineering discipline comprised of a set of verification and validation activities performed by an independent contractor to ensure that the system is well engineered and software meets the user's needs.

Solicitation

Project Management Support

Vendor – Unknown

Purchase Order Number – Pending

Amount: \$600,000

Term: 8/1/15 – 10/31/16

Based on consultation with CalTech, CalVCP is seeking project management support services to assist with the CaRES Modification Project.

Because the successful bids for the solicitations were not determined prior to the June Board meeting and there is no July meeting, the Board delegated to Executive Officer Nauman final approval to award the successful bidders for both solicitations. Executive Officer reported that she would announce the successful bidders at the August 20, 2015, Board meeting.

Item 5. Legislative Update

Wayne Strumpfer, VCGCB Chief Counsel, reported the following updates on bills impacting the VCGCB:

AB 1140 (Bonta) — Victim Compensation Program Modernization

The bill modernizes Victim Compensation Program statutes by making a number of changes to eligibility and benefits. Mr. Strumpfer reported that while the bill was in the Appropriations Committee, it was amended to increase the amount of the recommended appropriation for compensation of an erroneous conviction from \$100 to \$130 per day.

AB 165 (Gomez) — Government Claims Bill

VCGCB's first Government Claims Bill of 2015 appropriates \$504,743.99 to pay claims approved by the Board from May 2014 through December 2014. It also appropriates \$968,400 to pay the erroneous conviction claims of Ronald Ross, Susan Mellen, and Brian Banks. The bill has been signed by the Governor and payment to the three claimants is being expedited.

SB 84 – Budget Trailer Bill on State Government

The bill would create the Human Trafficking Victims Assistance Fund and require money in the fund to be used by the Office of Emergency Services (OES) for the distribution of grants to qualified nonprofit organizations providing services to victims of human trafficking and for reimbursement of costs incurred by the office in distributing these grants. The Budget Act for next year transfers \$10 million from the Restitution Fund to OES in support of the Program.

SB 304 (Lara) — Government Claims Bill

VCGCB's second Government Claims Bill of 2015 will appropriate the funds to pay claims approved by the Board from January 2015 through April 2015. The bill is on the Senate desk awaiting assignment to policy committees.

SB 518 (Leno) — Trauma Recovery Centers

The bill would require the Board to use the evidence-based Integrated Trauma Recovery Services model developed by the Trauma Recovery Center at San Francisco General Hospital as a criterion when it provides grants to trauma recovery centers. The bill is on the Assembly desk.

SB 519 (Hancock) — Victim Compensation Program

The bill would require all correspondence by the Victim Compensation Program to an applicant to be written in additional languages. It also would prohibit the Board from requiring an applicant to submit documentation from the Internal Revenue Service, the Franchise Tax Board, the State Board of Equalization, the Social Security Administration, or the Employment Development Department in order to determine eligibility. It would prohibit any regulation or policy creating a maximum award of less than \$7,500 for funeral and burial expenses. It would require the Board to approve or deny applications within 90 days total rather than an average of 90 days. The bill is on the Assembly desk.

SB 556 (De Leon) — Victims of Crime: Applications

The bill would define “time of processing applications” as the period of time that begins when the Board first receives an application and ends when a decision to approve or deny is made and notice is sent to the applicant. It would require the Board to post on its Internet Web site, on an annual basis, its progress and current average time of processing applications, the number of incomplete applications received, and the number of applications approved and denied. The bill is on the Assembly desk.

Item 6. Consent Agenda (Nos. 1-324)

Nicholas Wagner, Government Claims Program Manager, reported that consent agenda item numbers 59 and 280 were continued and item number 286 was removed from the consent agenda to allow the claimant an opportunity to address the Board.

The Board unanimously approved consent agenda numbers 1-324, as amended.

Consent Agenda Appearance

Item 286, 622555

Claim of James Quilici

James Quilici appeared and addressed the Board. Rosemarie Ruggieri, Senior Staff Counsel, attended on behalf of the Department of Motor Vehicles. Sergeant Ron Wade attended on behalf of the California Highway Patrol.

Nicholas Wagner, Government Claims Program Manager, explained that James Quilici requested leave to present a late claim for compensation from the California Highway Patrol (CHP) and the California Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) in an amount exceeding \$25,000 for wrongful arrest and negligence. He stated that Government Claims Program staff recommended that the Board deny the late application for failure to meet the criteria required in Government Code section 911.6 and reject the claim itself.

Mr. Quilici stated that an individual could be approved under Government Code section 911.6 if the person was unaware of the timeframe to present the claim. He commented that he was unaware of the timeframe. He explained that several factors not listed in the code section prevented him from filing his claim sooner such as his car being impounded for 30 days and his case not being dismissed until 212 days; however, he believed that Government Code section 911.2 still applied.

He explained that if he filed his claim by the first day of his arrest, it was 212 days until his case was dismissed which was beyond six months.

Sergeant Wade stated that the CHP and the Attorney General's Office requested the Board deny the late application for failure to meet the requirements of Government Code section 911.6 and requested the Board reject the claim due to its complexity.

Ms. Ruggieri stated that DMV concurred with the staff recommendation and the Attorney General's recommendation that the claim should be denied as a late claim under Government Code section 911.6 for failure to meet any of the criterion.

Mr. Quilici stated that it was not discovered that he was arrested for felony DUI until March 20, 2015; therefore, the date of discovery changed.

The Board unanimously adopted the staff recommendation and denied the late application for failure to meet the criteria required in Government Code section 911.6 and rejected the claim itself.

Item 7. Applications for Discharge From Accountability for Collection

The Board unanimously approved the 11 requests by State agencies for discharge from accountability for collection of debt totaling \$7,181,615.78.

Item 8. Request for Delegation of Authority by the Department of General Services

Nicholas Wagner, Government Claims Program Manager, explained that the Department of General Services (DGS) requested the Board grant it delegated authority to settle and pay or reject claims that do not exceed \$1,000 each during the period of July 1, 2015, through June 30, 2018. Government Claims Program staff recommended that the Board approve the request.

Mr. Wagner reported that during the previous delegation period, DGS received 18 claims. Of the 18 claims, 16 claims were allowed and payments totaled \$6,702.98 and two claims were rejected. No claims were currently being processed and the average processing time was 30 days.

The Board unanimously approved DGS' request for delegation of authority to settle and pay or reject claims that do not exceed \$1,000 each during the period of July 1, 2015, through June 30, 2018.

Item 9. Request for Delegation of Authority by the Department of State Hospitals

Nicholas Wagner, Government Claims Program Manager, explained that the Department of State Hospitals (DSH) requested the Board grant it delegated authority to settle and pay or reject claims that do not exceed \$1,000.00 each during the period of June 19, 2015, through June 22, 2017. Government Claims Program staff recommended that the Board approve the request.

Mr. Wagner reported that during the previous delegation period, DSH received 83 claims. Of the 83 claims, 28 were allowed in full and payments totaled \$3,621.44; 7 claims were partially allowed and payments totaled \$518.87; 37 claims were rejected; 1 claim was outside DSHs jurisdiction; and 10 claims were currently being processed. He explained that the average processing time was 46 days.

The Board unanimously approved DSH's request for delegation of authority to settle and pay or reject claims that do not exceed \$1,000 each during the period of June 19, 2015, through June 22, 2015.

Item 10. Claim of Timothy Atkins (Pen. Code, § 4900 et seq.)

Alexander Simpson, Associate Director, California Innocence Project, was in attendance on behalf of Timothy Atkins. Kenneth Sokoler, Deputy District Attorney, attended on behalf of the Attorney General's Office.

Wayne Strumpfer, VCGCB Chief Counsel, explained that Timothy Atkins was convicted by a jury of one count of murder and two counts of robbery stemming from a shooting death of Vicente Gonzales on January 1, 1985. Mr. Atkins was sentenced to 32 years to life in prison in February 1988. In 2006, he filed a writ of habeas corpus based mainly on a recanting witness. The Los Angeles County Superior Court granted the writ; however, the Los Angeles County District Attorney declined to retry the case and Mr. Atkins was released from prison on February 9, 2007, after serving 7,137 days incarceration.

Mr. Strumpfer explained that the matter first came to the Board in March 2010 when the Board denied Mr. Atkins' original claim. After a writ and appeal by Mr. Atkins of that decision, the Court of Appeals remanded the case to the Board with orders to conduct a new hearing and issue a new decision. This was ordered because the Court found that the Board, through verbal comments, made additional credibility determinations against Mr. Atkins and other witnesses that were not reflected in the Hearing Officer's proposed decision; therefore, the written proposed decision did not reflect the Board's final ruling.

While the matter was on appeal, Mr. Atkins returned to the Los Angeles County Superior Court and received a finding of factual innocence from a judge in August 2014. Mr. Strumpfer explained that the issues raised with Mr. Atkins' claim were which law applied to this case: Penal Code sections 4900 through 4904 as it was in 2010 or as it is written today and whether Mr. Atkins met his burden to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that he was innocent of the crimes for which he was incarcerated.

Mr. Strumpfer stated that the proposed decision determined that the changes to Penal Code sections 4900 to 4904 were not retroactive and therefore the law in effect in 2010 rules the Board's decision today. Moreover, the proposed decision found that the additional facts in the Superior Court finding last year of Mr. Atkins' factual innocence and the eyewitness testimony of Maria Gonzales being unreliable, lead to the determination that Mr. Atkins had proven his innocence by a preponderance of the evidence.

Mr. Simpson explained that Mr. Atkins was before the Board again after a prior determination. There were a number of proceedings that succeeded the determination, most importantly the determination by Judge Tynan who found Timothy Atkins innocent by a preponderance of the evidence. Judge Tynan heard the original trial and reversed the conviction. Judge Tynan had the opportunity to review everything in the case and was the best person to make a determination as to whether Timothy Atkins was innocent by a preponderance of the evidence.

Mr. Simpson stated that last year Judge Tynan considered the case again but that time it was not from the perspective of whether the prosecution proved their case beyond a reasonable doubt or whether Timothy Atkins was entitled to reversal of his conviction, but from the perspective of whether Timothy Atkins had established that he was innocent by a preponderance of the evidence as specified in Penal Code section 1485.55. He explained that after hearing from the California Innocence Project, the Los Angeles District Attorney's Association, and Mr. Sokoler from the Attorney General's Office, the Court concluded that Timothy Atkins had met his burden.

Mr. Simpson stated that there were comments made by the Attorney General's Office in the

response to the proposed decision such that Judge Tynan's analysis was in some way more circumscribed than what the Board's determination was, which was untrue. The Court had the opportunity to hear from all of the parties before it made its decision. He explained that there was now a finding from a sitting Superior Court judge who said that Mr. Atkins was innocent under the same standard the Board has to make, which made the hearing different from the prior hearing held in 2010.

Mr. Simpson explained that even though both sides may disagree regarding whether Penal Code section 1485.55 is binding on the Board or whether it is merely persuasive, the difference was the finding of innocence. He stated that Timothy Atkins had the right to claim compensation for his more than 20 years of wrongful incarceration and requested the Board make a recommendation to approve the claim.

Mr. Sokoler stated that the Attorney General's Office agreed with the Hearing Officer's conclusion that the new provisions enacted in January 2014 do not apply to the case; however, they disagreed with the effect of Judge Tynan's 2014 ruling. He explained that when the case was heard before the Board in March 2015, it did not appear that the Board regarded it as a close case; rather, the Board had not accompanied its decision with the requisite written findings. The only other issue of potential significance since the last hearing was Judge Tynan's finding under Penal Code section 1485.55.

Mr. Sokoler stated that the question before the Board was whether Judge Tynan's decision was so persuasive that the Board should reach a different conclusion than it reached in 2010. He explained that even though the Board could and should look at the judge's decision, it was not persuasive and did not carry the weight to cause the Board to change its decision. He explained that most significantly, Judge Tynan considered a different question than what was before the Board. Judge Tynan limited himself to the evidence presented at trial and to the evidence he previously heard at the habeas corpus hearing.

Mr. Sokoler stated that the issue before the Board was whether Mr. Atkins proved his claim based on the trial evidence, the habeas evidence, and all the additional evidence presented to the Board in 2009 and 2010 in the Penal Code section 4900 hearing. He stated that there was significant additional evidence presented that Judge Tynan did not consider. Some of that evidence was discussed explicitly at the March 2010 Board meeting. The evidence included Atkins' own statement to the police shortly after the crime in which he placed himself a couple of minutes after the murder and he identified Codefendant Ricky Evans as one of the assailants who ran up to him right after the murder and said they had just done a move. Additionally, Judge Tynan did not consider Ricky Evans' own statement to the police in which he admitted being with Timothy Atkins on the night of the murder. Timothy Atkins also admitted to the police that he spent part of the night of the murder in the company of Codefendant Ricky Evans. Mr. Sokoler explained that in addition to Ricky Evans identifying Mr. Atkins as one of the assailants, the surviving victim, Maria Gonzales, identified Ricky Evans from a photo six-pack. Another item that was presented to the Board that Judge Tynan did not consider was the statement of Mr. Atkins' cousin, Lee Dewberry, who stated to police that on January 1st he saw Mr. Atkins in possession of a necklace. That was significant because Maria Gonzales testified that Mr. Atkins ripped a necklace from her neck during the robbery; therefore, it corroborated her identification.

Mr. Sokoler stated that at the last Board meeting, the Board appeared to consider the statement of the confidential jailhouse informant who made a statement about an admission that Mr. Atkins made to him in jail significant. That statement was notable because it included numerous accurate details of the crime, including the color and make of the victim's car, the location where the crime occurred, the kinds of weapons used, the fact that a necklace was taken and, most significantly, the fact that the murder victim, Vicente Gonzales, was chubby. He explained that while informant's statements

are looked at very carefully, the informant had numerous accurate details about the crime. The informant stated that he had those conversations with Mr. Atkins while they were waiting to be transported to court. The informant also related accurately Timothy Atkins' statements about what happened on those court dates, which was the preliminary hearing in which Denise Powell testified against Timothy Atkins. Therefore, as the Board appeared to find at the previous meeting, the informant's statements were also quite persuasive and they were not considered by Judge Tynan who limited his consideration to the evidence presented at the habeas hearing and at trial.

Mr. Sokoler stated that Judge Tynan's decision was not legally binding on the Board and it was not persuasive because it did not consider the full range of evidence. Moreover, Judge Tynan's decision did not tell the Board anything that the Board was unaware of in 2010. When the Board decided the case in 2010, it was well aware that Judge Tynan found Denise Powell's recantation to be credible and that he did not give much weight to the eyewitness identification by Maria Gonzales. Nevertheless, the Board seemed to reach different conclusions as reflected in the Board's comments.

Mr. Sokoler explained that for the reasons stated, the Attorney General's Office believed that nothing significant changed since the Board previously rejected Mr. Atkins claim. He further stated that the Board should reject the claim again based on the wide scope of evidence presented.

Member Ramos explained that as he went through the issues, everyone agreed that the factual innocence was not binding upon the Board; however, it should give the Board great persuasion and weight to their analysis that they had before them again. He stated that he understood the limitations that were placed on the judge, whether those limitations were placed on him specifically by himself, by others, or the appellate process. Although he was the trial judge, he did not have the opportunity to view the additional evidence presented to the Board after Mr. Atkins was convicted by a jury trial.

Member Ramos stated that the next issue was the presumption of innocence. He explained that as he went back through everything in looking at those statements, he still felt the same way regarding the statements. He explained that when he has very difficult decisions, he always leaned towards the victims. A victim had been murdered. The victim's wife was there at the time her husband was shot and murdered and she suffered a significant emotional event. He explained that it could be argued both ways regarding identification of the suspect, but he could not get past Denise Powell who indicated that Timothy Atkins was part of the murder. Ms. Powell testified at the preliminary hearing and told everyone that she was scared and then she left. The Board did not have her testimony at trial, which could have been cross-examined. Immediately after the murder, Ms. Powell stated that Mr. Atkins was the person who was involved in the murder. The next day Mrs. Gonzales identified Mr. Atkins in a photo lineup. She did not speak with Denise Powell. He stated that the odds of that occurring were tremendous. She truly testified in Court under oath and said that Mr. Atkins was the one involved in the murder. Member Ramos stated that even though identification experts are very good at what they do, it was very concerning that the expert in the Atkins case did not attempt to interview Mrs. Gonzales or look at the photo lineup himself. Instead, the expert talked about generalities and the concept of the problems with eyewitness identification.

Member Ramos stated that for the reasons he outlined, he still believed that Mr. Atkins had not proven himself innocent; therefore, he opposed the staff's recommendation.

Chairperson Batjer stated that she found Judge Tynan's arguments and decision very persuasive. She explained that she had some questions about the eyewitnesses and the testimony of the unreliable witnesses; therefore, she could accept Judge Tynan's arguments. She stated that she had some concerns about Mrs. Gonzales' selection of the picture because she believed there was a question regarding the picture provided in the six-pack and whether it was a picture of Mr. Atkins

when he was 13 years of age. She explained that even though she agreed with Member Ramos regarding the fact that the expert witness did not interview Mrs. Gonzales, she understood and had some appreciation for the questions of an eyewitness when they are under the kind of emotional distress that Mrs. Gonzales obviously was and the difficulty in how she first identified the said murderer in terms of height and weight and whether the crime scene was illuminated properly. Chairperson Batjer stated that she knew the police report indicated that the crime scene was illuminated; however, there was enough doubt that she had serious concerns about the testimony of Mrs. Gonzales and Ms. Powell.

Lastly, Chairperson Batjer stated that the judge persuaded her because he was the original judge in the case, which carried incredible weight for her. Conversely, she was not persuaded by the argument set forth by the Attorney General's Office.

Member Ramos made a motion to oppose the staff recommendation and Member Chivaro seconded the motion. Chairperson Batjer voted to adopt the staff recommendation. The Board voted 2-1 to reject the staff recommendation. The Board found that the old law applied and that Mr. Atkins had not met his burden to prove innocence.

Mr. Strumpf explained that the hearing officer would rewrite the proposed decision based on the Board's decision and bring an amended proposed decision back to the Board in August.

Victim Compensation Program

The Board commenced the Victim Compensation Program portion of the meeting at 10:53 a.m.

Presentation of Baseline Data, Needs Assessment, and Gap Analysis Reports Pursuant to the Office for Victims of Crime Capacity Initiative and Technology Grant

Mindy Fox, CalVCP and Government Claims Program Deputy Executive Officer, presented a status report on three grants CalVCP received from the Office for Victims of Crime (OVC).

Ms. Fox explained that the first grant was year 1 of the Compensation Initiative Grant (federal fiscal years 2013-2014) that began in October 2013. CalVCP is now fulfilling its grant commitments for year 2 of the Compensation Initiative Grant (federal fiscal years 2014-2015) and simultaneously the commitments for the Building State Technology Capacity Grant (federal fiscal years 2014-2015 and 2015-2016).

Compensation Initiative Grant Year 1

In October 2013, CalVCP was awarded \$245,440 from OVC. CalVCP promised OVC that it would identify the underserved victims of crime, identify barriers, determine victims' unmet needs, and identify strategies to improve access and awareness to better meet those needs.

There were four deliverables in the first grant: Baseline Data Report, Needs Assessment Report, Gap Analysis Report, and Implementation Plan.

Baseline Data Report

In California, nearly one in five individuals has limited proficiency with English. The report revealed that community-based organizations helping underserved communities need ongoing training and tools to help connect victims to compensation and specialized victim advocates. Once a victim applies to the Program, culturally appropriate medical and mental health treatment services are available for victims.

Needs Assessment Report

It was determined that the underserved crime victim communities in California included tribal communities, people with disabilities, people who are homeless, victims of human trafficking, communities affected by gang violence, the LGBT communities, immigrants, the elderly, people who suffer from mental illness, people with limited English proficiency, persons of Asian Pacific Islander descent, and residents of rural or frontier communities. The community-based organizations and mental health providers reported that their clients unmet needs were childcare, housing, financial assistance, transportation, and medical and mental health services. The barriers to receiving services included lack of compensation information in a variety of languages, lack of advocates, not enough training and education, and lack of an online application.

Gap Analysis Report

The gaps in services included significant language barriers; critical need for ongoing training; lack of linguistically and culturally competent resources; critical need of collaboration with community-based organizations, advocates, providers, and law enforcement; fear; need for improved use of technology; and enhanced compensation benefits for relocation, funeral/burial, transportation, legal costs, and costs associated with appointments such as child care and lost wages.

Implementation Plan

The goal is to identify and document strategies to reach underserved crime victims, increase access, remove barriers, and better meet victims' needs. The Implementation Plan strategies include creating a Collaboration Plan to more fully connect with the community-based organizations, providers, and advocates who work with the underserved populations identified through the grant efforts; translating the CalVCP application and outreach materials into the 11 languages selected based on a survey of the most frequent languages utilized within the California court system; providing engaging e-learning courses available 24/7 for system-based advocates, services providers, law enforcement, medical personnel, and the general public; hosting two regional conferences that will be held at UC Davis and UCLA on September 22, 2015 and October 8, 2015, respectively; and changing policies and statutes to enhance benefits.

Compensation Initiative Grant Year 2

CalVCP was awarded \$400,000 from OVC for the CalVCP Compensation Improvement Project. CalVCP is in the process of implementing all of the strategies identified in the Implementation Plan with funds from year 2 of the OVC Compensation Initiative Grant. There will be future ongoing costs to sustain those activities. The strategies will improve accessibility, responsiveness, and efficiency of compensation provided to victims. Each strategy may bridge multiple gaps, meet multiple unmet needs, and overcome multiple barriers all with the intention of better reaching and serving underserved crime victims.

Building State Technology Capacity Grant

In November 2014, CalVCP was awarded the Office for Victims of Crime Vision 21: Building State Technology Capacity federal grant. The two-year grant provides \$250,000 of funding and concludes in September 2016. The two-year grant allows the VCGCB to complete the planning process for an online access (OLA) system. The OLA system is envisioned to allow victims and advocates to submit applications online and provide victims, advocates, and service providers access to information about the status of applications and bills. The fund will not create the OLA system; instead, it funds the efforts a State department must complete before it can embark on a large IT project.

Ms. Fox explained that CalVCP staff would prepare recommendations to revise compensation categories and benefits based on the needs assessment findings for Board approval. Staff will review current compensation categories and benefits and make recommendations in alignment with the needs assessment findings. The recommendations may include: (1) reverting funeral burial to the pre-April 2011 limit of \$7,500; (2) expanding transportation costs to include mental health service appointments, meetings with advocates and attending court; (3) expanding benefits to include legal costs for filing civil restraining orders and childcare costs during times when the victim is obtaining services and attending court; and (4) expanding relocation benefits to include costs of movers or truck rental.

Ms. Fox commented that the documents presented would be submitted to OVC as part of CalVCPs grant agreement. Further discussion would occur at the California Crime Victim Services Summit on November 3, 2015, in San Diego.

Closed Session

Pursuant to Government Code section 11126(c)(3), the Board adjourned into Closed Session with the Board's Executive Officer and Chief Counsel at 11:29 a.m. to deliberate on proposed decision numbers 1-84.

Open Session

The Board reconvened into Open Session pursuant to Government Code section 11126 (c)(3) at 11:40 a.m. The Board adopted the hearing officer's recommendations for proposed decision numbers 1-84, with the exception of numbers 61B, 61C, 61D, 62B, and 62C, which were removed and referred back to staff.

Adjournment

The Board meeting adjourned at 11:41 a.m.